arXiv:1602.07931v1 [math-ph] 25 Feb 2016

Geometry of the basic statistical physics mapping

Mario Angelelli[1] **and Boris Konopelchenko**[1]

[1]Department of Mathematics and Physics "Ennio De Giorgi", University of Salento and Sezione INFN, 73100, Lecce, Italy

E-mail: mario.angelelli@le.infn.it, boris.konopeltchenko@unisalento.it

Abstract.

Geometry of hypersurfaces defined by the relation which generalizes classical formula for free energy in terms of microstates is studied. Induced metric, Riemann curvature tensor, Gauss-Kronecker curvature and associated entropy are calculated. Special class of ideal statistical hypersurfaces is analyzed in details. Non-ideal hypersurfaces and their singularities similar to those of the phase transitions are considered. Tropical limit of statistical hypersurfaces and double scaling tropical limit are discussed too.

PACS numbers: 02.40, 02.50, 05.90

Keywords: statistical hypersurface, metric, curvature, tropical limit.

1. Introduction

One of main formulae of statistical physics

$$F = -kT \ln \left(\sum_{\{n\}} e^{-\frac{E_{\{n\}}}{kT}} \right) \tag{1.1}$$

establishes the relation between the set of microstates of the macroscopic systems with the energies $E_{\{n\}}$, enumerated by quantum numbers $\{n\}$, at the temperature T (k is the Boltzmann constant), and the macroscopic free energy F (see e.g. [1]). The microstates are realized with the Gibbs probability

$$w_{\{n\}} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{E_{\{n\}}}{kT}\right)}{\sum_{\{m\}} \exp\left(-\frac{E_{\{m\}}}{kT}\right)}. \tag{1.2}$$

Mathematically, the formula (1.1) provides us with the mapping of the point-set $\{f_1, f_2, \ldots\}$ to the function $f = \ln \left(\sum_{\{n\}} e^{f_{\{n\}}} \right)$ in terms of the quantities $f_{\{n\}} \equiv -\frac{E_{\{n\}}}{kT}$

and $f \equiv -\dfrac{F}{kT}$. In such a micro-macro mapping these quantities depend, in fact, on several parameters. First, they are explicitly functions of the temperature T. Then, the energy spectrum $E_{\{n\}}$ typically depends on some parameters. In addition, the standard approach to complex systems requires to deal with a family of systems with close properties (e.g., with varying $E_{\{n\}}$) in order to reveal their characteristic features.

All this suggests to consider, instead of the mapping (1.1), the general mapping

$$F = \ln\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} e^{f_\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_n)}\right) \tag{1.3}$$

with real-valued functions f_α of n real variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and arbitrary n and m. Study of geometrical objects related to the mapping (1.3) and probabilities

$$w_\alpha = \frac{e^{f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})}}{\sum\limits_{\beta=1}^{m} e^{f_\beta(\boldsymbol{x})}}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m \tag{1.4}$$

is the main goal of this paper.

Geometrical structures associated with the standard thermodynamics have been already discussed many times (see e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]). Interrelation of geometry and certain statistical models has been considered too (see e.g. [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]).

In the present paper we, in contrast to the phenomenological Geometrothermodynamics [6, 7], start with the generalization (1.3) of the micro-macro mapping (1.1). We treat it as the definition of the n-dimensional hypersurface V_n (referred hereafter as statistical hypersurface) in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with local coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1} \equiv F)$ and analyse its geometry. Since $\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial f_\alpha} = w_\alpha$ and $dF = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \dfrac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i} dx_i$, the probabilities (1.4) show up in all geometrical objects associated with the hypersurface V_n. It is a characteristic feature of the hypersurface V_n defined by the formula (1.3). In particular, the induced metric g_{ik} is of the form

$$g_{ik} = \delta_{ik} + \bar{f}_i \cdot \bar{f}_k, \quad i, k = 1, \dots, n \tag{1.5}$$

where $\bar{f}_i \doteq \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \dfrac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i}$. Second fundamental form, Christoffel symbols, Riemann curvature tensor and Gauss-Kronecker curvature are also expressed via this and similar mean values. In general, the metric (1.5) is not flat.

In addition to the standard geometrical questions, physics suggests to address the problems which mimic those typical for statistical physics, for instance properties of ideal and non-ideal systems, phase transitions *etc.* [1]. The simplest model of an ideal gas corresponds to linear functions $f_\alpha = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x_i + b_\alpha$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$, where $a_{\alpha i}$ and b_α are constants. In this case $\bar{f}_i = \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha a_{\alpha i}$ and all formulae are simplified drastically.

However, the Riemann curvature remains nonvanishing. The special feature of this case is that the Gauss-Kronecker curvature of such ideal hypersurface V_n is equal to zero if rank of the matrix $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_{\alpha i})$ is smaller than n.

Super-ideal case with $m = n$ and $f_\alpha = x_\alpha$, $\alpha = 1, \ldots, n$, is studied in details. It is shown that scalar and mean curvatures of the corresponding statistical hypersurfaces are non-negative and have upper bounds depending on n.

It is shown that for nonlinear functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$, which correspond to non-ideal macroscopic systems even in the simplest cases $n = 2, 3$, the Gauss-Kronecker curvature, in general, is different from zero.

Phase transitions of the first order for macroscopic systems are mimicked by discontinuities of the metric (1.5) and singularities of the curvature. It is shown that the geometrical characteristics may have various types of behaviours for such singularities.

The geometrical interpretation of the classical entropy $S = -\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \ln w_\alpha$ and its connection with the coupling between the hypersurface V_n and its normal bundle is considered. It is shown that in the particular case when all functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ are homogeneous functions of degree one the entropy is given by the scalar product

$$S = \sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}\, \overrightarrow{X} \cdot \overrightarrow{N} \tag{1.6}$$

where $\overrightarrow{X}$ and $\overrightarrow{N}$ are position vector and normal vector at the point on the hypersurface V_n, respectively.

Tropical limit of statistical hypersurfaces is discussed too. The standard tropical limit of the ideal hypersurface is given by a piecewise hyperplane. It is shown that the analysis of non-ideal cases, in general, requires to use double-scaling tropical limit. Piecewise curved hypersurfaces represent tropical limit of non-ideal hypersurface. So, in the tropical limit the difference between ideal and non-ideal cases becomes easily visible.

The paper is organized as follows. In section (2) formulae for metric, second fundamental form, Riemann curvature tensor and Gauss-Kronecker curvature of statistical hypersurface V_n are presented. Ideal hypersurfaces which mimic ideal gas are studied in section (3). Super-ideal hypersurfaces are discussed in section (4). Non-ideal cases with nonlinear functions $\{f_\alpha\}$ are considered in section (5). Singularities of statistical hypersurface are analyzed in section (6). Section (7) is devoted to the study of tropical limit of statistical hypersurfaces. Double scaling tropical limit is discussed in section (8).

2. Geometric characteristics of statistical hypersurfaces

The formula (1.3) can be viewed in various ways to define geometrical objects. We will follow the simplest and standard one, i.e. to view the graph of function given by (1.3) as a hypersurface in $(n+1)$-dimensional Euclidean space with cartesian coordinates $x_1, x_2 \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1} \equiv F$. Thus, the induced metric of this hypersurface V_n is (see e.g.

[15])

$$g_{ik} = \delta_{ik} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} \cdot \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}, \quad i,\, k = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.1}$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial f_\alpha} = \frac{e^{f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})}}{\sum_{\beta=1}^{m} e^{f_\beta(\boldsymbol{x})}} \equiv w_\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{2.2}$$

one has

$$g_{ik} = \delta_{ik} + \bar{f}_i \cdot \bar{f}_k, \quad i,\, k = 1, \ldots, n \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\bar{f}_i \doteq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.4}$$

Then $0 \leq w_\alpha \leq 1$, $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha = 1$. So the quantity w_α represents the probability to have function f_α from the set $\{f_1, f_2, \ldots f_m\}$. It is a membership function in terminology of Fuzzy sets (see e.g. [16, 17]). The presence of this generalized Gibbs probability (or Gibbs membership function) and mean values $\bar{f}_i$ (2.4) is a characterizing feature of all geometric quantities associated with the statistical hypersurface V_n.

Using the standard formulae (see e.g. [15]), one calculates other characteristics of the hypersurface V_n. The position vector $\vec{X}(\boldsymbol{x})$ for a point on V_n and the corresponding normal vector $\vec{N}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are

$$\begin{aligned} &\vec{X} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}), \\ &\vec{N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}} \left(-\bar{f}_1, \ldots, -\bar{f}_n, 1\right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\det \boldsymbol{g} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{f}_i^2$. So the second fundamental form Ω_{ik} is given by

$$\Omega_{ik} = \vec{N} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 \vec{X}}{\partial x_i \partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}} \left(\bar{f}_{\{ik\}} - \bar{f}_i \cdot \bar{f}_k\right), \quad i,\, k = 1, \ldots, n \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\bar{f}_{\{ik\}} \doteq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_\alpha}{\partial x_i \partial x_k} + \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i} \cdot \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_k} \right), \quad i,\, k = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.7}$$

Then, since

$$\frac{\partial g_{ik}}{\partial x_l} = \sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}} \left(\Omega_{il} \bar{f}_k + \Omega_{kl} \bar{f}_i\right), \quad l = 1, \ldots, n \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \det \boldsymbol{g} = 2\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Omega_{ik} \cdot \frac{\partial x_{n+1}}{\partial x_k}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.9}$$

one has the Christoffel symbols

$$\Gamma^k_{ij} = \frac{\bar{f}_k \Omega_{ij}}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}}, \quad i,j,k = 1,\ldots,n \tag{2.10}$$

and Riemann curvature tensor

$$R_{iklm} = \Omega_{il}\Omega_{km} - \Omega_{kl}\Omega_{im}, \quad i,k,l,m = 1,\ldots,n. \tag{2.11}$$

that is the classical Gauss equation. For Ricci tensor and scalar curvature one gets

$$R_{ij} = (\mathrm{Tr}\boldsymbol{\Omega})\cdot\Omega_{ij} - \frac{\sum\limits_{k,l=1}^{n} \bar{f}_k \Omega_{kl} \bar{f}_l}{\det \boldsymbol{g}} \Omega_{ij} - (\Omega^2)_{ij} + \frac{1}{4\det \boldsymbol{g}^2} \frac{\partial \det \boldsymbol{g}}{\partial x_i} \cdot \frac{\partial \det \boldsymbol{g}}{\partial x_j}, \tag{2.12}$$

$$R = (\mathrm{Tr}\boldsymbol{\Omega})^2 - \mathrm{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2] + 2\frac{\sum\limits_{i,j,k=1}^{n} \bar{f}_i \cdot (\Omega_{ik}\Omega_{kj} - \Omega_{kk}\cdot\Omega_{ij})\bar{f}_j}{\det \boldsymbol{g}} \tag{2.13}$$

where $(\boldsymbol{\Omega})_{ij} = \Omega_{ij}$.

Finally, the Gauss-Kronecker curvature of the statistical hypersurface V_n is given by

$$K \doteq \frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Omega}}{\det \boldsymbol{g}} = \frac{\det \left| \bar{f}_{\{ik\}} - \bar{f}_i \cdot \bar{f}_k \right|}{\left(1 + \sum\limits_{l=1}^{n} \bar{f}_l^2\right)^{\frac{n+2}{2}}}. \tag{2.14}$$

Entropy $S = -\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \ln w_\alpha$, fundamental quantity in statistical physics, has also a simple geometrical meaning. Namely,

$$S = x_{n+1} - \bar{f} \tag{2.15}$$

where $\bar{f} = \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha f_\alpha$, i.e. it is the deviation of the point on the hypersurface from the mean value of functions f_α, $\alpha = 1,\ldots,m$.

Entropy is closely connected also with the scalar product $\overrightarrow{X}\cdot\overrightarrow{N}$ of the position vector $\overrightarrow{X}$ for the point on the hypersurface and the corresponding normal vector $\overrightarrow{N}$. Indeed taking into account (2.5) one has

$$\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}\, \overrightarrow{X}\cdot\overrightarrow{N} = x_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \bar{f}_i. \tag{2.16}$$

So

$$S = \sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}\, \overrightarrow{X}\cdot\overrightarrow{N} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i} - f_\alpha \right). \tag{2.17}$$

In particular, if all functions f_α are homogeneous functions of $x_1,\ldots,x_n$ of degree d then $S = \sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}\, \overrightarrow{X}\cdot\overrightarrow{N} + (d-1)\bar{f}$. For $d = 1$ one has $S = \sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}}\, \overrightarrow{X}\cdot\overrightarrow{N}$.

3. Ideal hypersurfaces

For ideal macroscopic systems the energy is a sum of energies of individual particles or molecules which have their own energy spectrum [1]. In general, such ideal situations are represented by functions f_α which are decomposed into the sum of functions depending on separate groups of variables, i.e.

$$f_\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_n) = f_{\alpha_1}(x_1,\dots,x_{n_1}) + f_{\alpha_2}(x_{n_1+1},\dots,x_{n_2}) + \\ \dots + f_{\alpha_l}(x_{n_l+1},\dots,x_n) \tag{3.1}$$

with some functions f_{α_p}, $\alpha_p = 1,\dots,m_p$ and $p = 1,\dots,l$. For instance, $f_\alpha(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = f_{\alpha_1}(x_1,x_2)+f_{\alpha_2}(x_3,x_4)$. In this case also the general mapping (1.3) is effectively decomposed and the corresponging hypersurface has several special features connected with effective separation of groups of variables $\{x\}_p$.

Here we will consider the simplest version of such ideal situation with linear functions f_α, i.e.

$$f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i}x_i + b_\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1,\dots,m, \tag{3.2}$$

where $a_{\alpha i}$ and b_α are constants. In this case

$$\bar{f}_i = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha a_{\alpha i} \doteq \bar{a}_i, \quad i = 1,\dots,n \tag{3.3}$$

and hence one has

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \bar{a}_i\cdot\bar{a}_j, \quad i,j = 1,\dots,n, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\Omega_{ij} = \frac{\overline{a^2_{ij}} - \bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j}{\sqrt{1+\sum_{l=1}^{n}\bar{a}_l^2}}, \quad i,j = 1,\dots,n \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$\overline{a^2_{ij}} \doteq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha a_{\alpha i}a_{\alpha j}, \quad i,j = 1,\dots,n \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$R = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\overline{a^2_{ii}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{a}_i^2\right)^2 - \sum_{i,k=1}^{n}(\overline{a^2_{ik}} - \bar{a}_i\bar{a}_k)^2}{1+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{a}_i^2} \\ +2\frac{\sum_{i,k,l=1}^{n}\overline{a^2_{il}}\cdot\overline{a^2_{lk}}\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_k - \overline{a^2_{ll}}\cdot\overline{a^2_{ik}}\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_k - \bar{a}_i^2\cdot\bar{a}_l\bar{a}_k\overline{a^2_{lk}}}{\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{a}_i^2\right)^2} \\ +2\frac{\sum_{i,k,l=1}^{n}\overline{a^2_{ll}}\bar{a}_i^2\cdot\bar{a}_k^2 - \overline{a^2_{il}}\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_l\cdot\bar{a}_k^2 + \overline{a^2_{ik}}\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_k\bar{a}_l^2}{\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{a}_i^2\right)^2} \tag{3.7}$$

All these expressions contain the matrix $\left(\overline{a^2_{ij}} - \bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j\right)_{i,j}$ which can be rewritten as

$$\left(\overline{a^2_{ij}} - \bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j\right)_{i,j} = (\boldsymbol{a}^T H\boldsymbol{a})_{ij} \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$H_{\alpha\beta} \doteq \delta_{\alpha\beta} w_\alpha - w_\alpha w_\beta, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{3.9}$$

The Gauss-Kronecker curvature then is

$$K = \frac{\det \left| \boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a} \right|}{\left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} \bar{a}_l^2 \right)^{\frac{n+2}{2}}}. \tag{3.10}$$

We note that if one considers a vector of n random variables $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, which takes values $(a_{\alpha 1}, \ldots, a_{\alpha n})$ with probability w_α, then (3.8) is the covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{X}$. We also observe that in this ideal case a hypersurface V_n has non-trivial characteristics. In general Riemann curvature tensor, scalar curvature and Gauss-Kronecker curvature are different from zero. A sharp difference between this result and those of Geometrothermodynamics [5, 18] is noted.

Particular choices of the constants $a_{\alpha i}$ provide us with special ideal hypersurfaces V_n. In particular, due to the presence of the matrix $\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}$ in formulae (3.5)-(3.10), the rank of the matrix $\boldsymbol{a}$ (in general, rectangular $m \times n$ matrix) plays fundamental role in characterization of algebraic properties of Christoffel symbols, Riemann curvature tensor and Gauss-Kronecker curvature. First, we observe that in virtue of the normalization condition $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha = 1$, $\det H = 0$. One also has

Proposition 3.1 *The matrix H is positive semidefinite and has rank $m - 1$.*

Proof: The Hessian matrix of a linear model is positive semidefinite since it is a covariance matrix. In particular, H is positive semidefinite since it is the Hessian matrix in the case $F(\boldsymbol{x}) = \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} e^{x_i} \right)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_m)^T \neq \boldsymbol{0}$ be an eigenvector of H: one has $\sum_{j=1}^{m} (\delta_{ij} w_i - w_i w_j) \zeta_j = w_i \zeta_i - w_i \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j \zeta_j \doteq w_i \zeta_i - w_i \overline{\zeta}$. If $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ is a null eigenvector then $w_i \zeta_i = w_i \overline{\zeta}$. Since $w_i \neq 0$ by hypothesis, one gets $\zeta_i = \overline{\zeta}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Then all ζ_i are equal, so $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \overline{\zeta} \cdot (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$ is the unique eigenvector for eigenvalue 0 up to a constant $\overline{\zeta}$. All other eigenvalues are strictly positive, so $\mathrm{rank} H = m - 1$. □

Then, due to standard properties of the matrices (see e.g. [19]), one has

$$\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) \leq \min\{\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}), m - 1\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Since $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}) \leq \min\{m, n\}$ one has

$$\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) \leq \min\{n, m - 1\}. \tag{3.12}$$

So, if $n \geq m$, then $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) \leq m - 1 < n$ and, hence, the matrix $\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}$ is degenerate. In particular, in this case the Gauss-Kronecker curvature vanishes

$$K = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

and the second fundamental form is degenerate.

If instead $m > n$, then Gauss-Kronecker curvature for an ideal model (3.2) vanishes if and only if there exists $\vec{x}_0 = (x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}) \neq (0, \ldots, 0)$ such that $f_\alpha(\vec{x}) - b_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x_{0i}$ is independent of α for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$. Indeed, if $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}) < n$ then Gauss-Kronecker curvature is zero since $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) \leq \mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}) < n$. In this case there exists a vector $\vec{x}_0 = (x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}) \neq (0, \ldots, 0)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x_{0i} = 0$ for all $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$. At this point $x_{n+1} \equiv \ln\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} e^{b_\alpha}\right)$. Then assume that $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}) = n$ and let us denote $\vec{o}_m \doteq (\underbrace{1, 1, \ldots, 1}_{m})^T$. If there exists $\vec{x}_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\boldsymbol{a} \cdot \vec{x}_0 = \vec{o}_m$, i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x_{0i} = 1$ for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$, then $\vec{x}_0$ is a null eigenvector for $\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}$ and $\det(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) = 0$. On the other hand, suppose that $\boldsymbol{a} \cdot \vec{x}$ is not proportional to $\vec{o}_m$ for all $\vec{x}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and consider $(\boldsymbol{a} \cdot \vec{x})^T \cdot H \cdot (\boldsymbol{a} \cdot \vec{x}) = \vec{x}^T \cdot (\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) \cdot \vec{x}$ for a generic vector $\vec{x}$. We know from Proposition 3.1 that this quantity is non-negative and it vanishes if and only if $\boldsymbol{a} \cdot \vec{x}$ is proportional to $\vec{o}_m$. But this contradicts our assumption, hence $\vec{x}^T \cdot (\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) \cdot \vec{x}$ is strictly positive for all $\vec{x}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. This means that $\det(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) > 0$.

For general ideal hypersurface V_n with f_α given by (3.2) and $b_\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$ the entropy S is given by formula (1.6).

There is one particular case of ideal statistical hypersurfaces closely connected with the multi-soliton solutions of Korteweg–de Vries (KdV) and Kadomtsev–Petviashvili (KP) II equations. Indeed, with the choice $a_{\alpha i} = \sum_{l=1}^{N} \eta_{\alpha l} (p_{l-1})^{2i-1}$, $i = 1, 2$, $\alpha = 1, \ldots, 2^N$ where p_l are arbitrary constants and rows of the matrix $\eta_{\alpha l}$ represent all possible distributions of 0 and 1, one has $x_3 = \log \tau$ where τ is the tau-function of KdV equation [20]. In the generic case of all distinct p_l $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \min\{2, 2^N\} = 2$ and $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a}) = \min\{2, 2^N - 1\}$. So for a statistical surface defined by one-soliton $\log \tau$ ($N = 1$) the Gauss curvature vanishes. At the multi-soliton cases ($N \geq 2$) generically $K \neq 0$. For the multi-soliton solutions common for the M first KdV flows ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, M+1$) $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \min\{M+1, 2^N\}$. So, at sufficiently large M $\mathrm{rank}(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a})$ can be smaller than $M + 1$ and, hence, for the corresponding statistical hypersurface the Gauss-Kronecker curvature vanishes.

Multi-soliton $\log \tau$ for the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili (KP) II equation and hierarchy also correspond to this case with more complicated form of rectangular matrices $a_{\alpha i}$ (see e.g. [28, 29]). Again one-soliton statistical hypersurface has Gauss-Kronecker curvature equal to zero while there are various different cases for general (N, M) solitons. This problem will be discussed in details elsewhere.

Finally, we note that in the case when all $a_{\alpha i}$ are positive integers $n_{\alpha i}$ the ideal mapping (1.3)-(3.2) in terms of variables y_i defined as $x_i = \log y_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n+1$, turns

to a pure algebraic one

$$y_{n+1} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} c_\alpha \prod_{i=1}^{n} (y_i)^{n_{\alpha i}} \tag{3.14}$$

where $c_\alpha \doteq e^{b_\alpha}$. In physical context such $n_{\alpha i}$ have clear meaning of occupation numbers and $\bar{a}_i = \overline{n_i}$ are their mean values. In geometry the formula (3.14) provides us with algebraic hypersurfaces (if one treats $y_1, \ldots, y_{n+1}$ as local coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$).

4. Super-ideal hypersurfaces

In the special ideal case with $m = n$ and $a_{\alpha i} = \delta_{\alpha i}$, $b_\alpha = 0$ where $\delta_{\alpha i}$ is the Kronecker symbol all formulae are drastically simplified. Indeed, one has

$$x_{n+1} = \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} e^{x_i} \right) \tag{4.1}$$

and hence

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + w_i w_j, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\Omega_{ij} = \frac{w_i(\delta_{ij} - w_j)}{\sqrt{1 + S_2}}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{sijk} = \frac{1}{1 + S_2} \, & (\delta_{js}\delta_{ik} w_i w_j - \delta_{js} w_i w_j w_k - \delta_{ks}\delta_{ij} w_i w_k + \delta_{ks} w_i w_j w_k \\ & + \delta_{ij} w_i w_k w_s - \delta_{ik} w_i w_j w_s) \,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ik} = -\frac{1}{(1 + S_2)^2} \, & [((1 + S_2)(1 + \delta_{ik}) - (1 + w_i)(1 + w_k)) w_i w_k \\ & + (S_3 - 1)(\delta_{ik} w_i - w_i w_k)] \,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

$$R = \frac{2(1 + S_4)}{(1 + S_2)^2} - 1 \tag{4.6}$$

and mean curvature (see e.g. [15])

$$\Omega \doteq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} g^{ij} \Omega_{ij} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{w_i w_j}{1 + S_2} \right) \Omega_{ij} = \frac{1 - S_3}{(1 + S_2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \tag{4.7}$$

where S_p are power sums

$$S_p \doteq \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^p. \tag{4.8}$$

Finally, Gauss-Kronecker curvature is

$$K = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Vanishing of the Gauss-Kronecker curvature for the super-ideal case is connected with the fact that hypersurface V_n defined by (4.2) admits the symmetry transformation

$$x_i \mapsto x_i' = x_i + a, \quad i = 1, \dots, n+1 \tag{4.10}$$

with arbitrary parameter a and corresponding Killing vector is $\mathcal{K} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$. We note that the probabilities w_i are invariant under the transformation (4.10).

All geometric characteristics of super-ideal hypersurface are algebraic functions of the Gibbs probabilities $w_i = \frac{e^{x_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{x_j}}$. These variables $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ obey the constraint $S_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1$ and vary in the intervals which depend on intervals of variations of variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Here we will consider the case when all x_i are unbounded. So $0 \le w_i \le 1$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and the point $\vec{w}$ belong to the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1$ passing through the vertices $\vec{e}_\alpha$ ($(\vec{e}_\alpha)_i = \delta_{\alpha i}$, $\alpha, i = 1, \dots, n$) of the unit n-dimensional cube in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Scalar and mean curvatures (4.6)-(4.7) have special properties due to their simple dependence only on the power sums S_2, S_3, S_4. Indeed, one has

Proposition 4.1 *Mean and scalar curvatures of super-ideal statistical hypersurfaces take values in the intervals*

$$0 \le \Omega \le \frac{n-1}{\sqrt{n(n+1)}}, \qquad 0 \le R \le \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{n(n+1)}. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof: First we observe that the classical power mean (Hölder) inequality (see e.g. [21])

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^p}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \ge \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i}{n} \tag{4.12}$$

with integer $p \ge 1$ in our case ($S_1 = 1$) implies

$$S_p \ge \frac{1}{n^{p-1}}. \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, the power sums are bounded

$$\frac{1}{n^{p-1}} \le S_p \le 1, \quad p = 2, 3, 4 \dots \tag{4.14}$$

The maximum value $(S_p)_{\max} = 1$ is achieved at the vertex poins $\vec{e}_\alpha$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$ while $(S_p)_{\min} = \frac{1}{n^{p-1}}$ at the point $\vec{e}_0 = \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right)$.

The values of Ω and R at these particular points provide us also with their lower and upper bounds. Since $S_3 \le 1$ one immediately concludes from the formula (4.7) that the mean curvature $\Omega \ge 0$ and $\Omega|_{\vec{e}_\alpha} = 0$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$.

Then for the maximum of Ω one gets

$$\Omega_{\max} = \frac{\max\{1 - S_3\}}{\min\{(1 + S_2)^{\frac{3}{2}}\}} = \frac{1 - \min\{S_3\}}{(1 + \min\{S_2\})^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \frac{n-1}{\sqrt{n(n+1)}} = \Omega|_{\vec{e}_0}. \tag{4.15}$$

For the scalar curvature one also has $R|_{\vec{e}_\alpha} = 0$, $\alpha = 1, \ldots, n$. In order to prove that $R \geq 0$ it is sufficient to show that

$$\hat{R}(w_1, \ldots, w_n) \doteq 2S_4 + 2 - (1 + S_2)^2 \geq 0 \tag{4.16}$$

First, one can show that for any $2 \leq i \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{R}(w_1, \ldots, w_n) - \hat{R}(w_1 + w_i, w_2, \ldots, w_{i-1}, 0, w_{i+1}, \ldots, w_n) \\ &\qquad = 4w_1 w_i \left[1 - (w_1 + w_i)^2 + \sum_{j \neq 1,i} w_j^2\right] \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

since $0 \leq w_1 + w_i \leq 1$. So one has a chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}(\vec{w}) &\geq \hat{R}(w_1 + w_n, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-1}, 0) \\ &\geq \hat{R}(w_1 + w_n + w_{n-1}, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-2}, 0, 0) \geq \ldots \\ &\geq \hat{R}(w_1 + w_2 + \ldots + w_n, 0, 0, \ldots, 0) = \hat{R}(1, 0, \ldots, 0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Since $\hat{R}(1, 0, \ldots, 0) = 0$ one gets (4.16) and, consequently, $R \geq 0$.

One can also show that

$$\hat{R}(\vec{w}_{(ij)}) - \hat{R}(\vec{w}) = (w_i - w_j)^2 \cdot \left[1 - (w_i + w_j)^2 + \sum_{k \neq i,j} w_k^2\right] \geq 0 \tag{4.19}$$

for any $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$ where

$$\vec{w}_{(ij)} \doteq \left(w_1, \ldots, w_{i-1}, \frac{w_i + w_j}{2}, w_{i+1}, \ldots, w_{j-1}, \frac{w_i + w_j}{2}, w_{j+1}, \ldots, w_n\right). \tag{4.20}$$

Then, since $S_2(\vec{w}) - S_2(\vec{w}_{(ij)}) = \dfrac{(w_i - w_j)^2}{2} \geq 0$ one has $\dfrac{1}{\left(1 + S_2(\vec{w}_{(ij)})\right)^2} \geq \dfrac{1}{(1 + S_2(\vec{w}))^2}$.

Hence

$$R(\vec{w}_{(ij)}) \geq R(\vec{w}) \tag{4.21}$$

for any $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$.

The inequality (4.21) implies that the maximum of R is reached if $R(\vec{w}_{(ij)}) = R(\vec{w})$ for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$. This happens at $w_1 = w_2 = \ldots = w_n$, i.e. at the point $\vec{e}_0 = \left(\dfrac{1}{n}, \ldots, \dfrac{1}{n}\right)$. Thus, $R_{\max} = R|_{\vec{e}_0}$, i.e.

$$R_{\max} = \frac{2\left(1 + \dfrac{1}{n^3}\right)}{\left(1 + \dfrac{1}{n}\right)^2} = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{n(n+1)}. \tag{4.22}$$

□

Note also that

$$\left(\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}} \cdot \Omega\right)|_{\vec{e}_0} = \frac{n-1}{n} \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$(\det \boldsymbol{g} \cdot R)\,|_{\vec{e}_0} = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{n^2}. \tag{4.24}$$

The point $\vec{e}_0$ corresponds to the straight line $x_1 = x_2 = \ldots = x_n$.

Finally, in the super-ideal case (4.2) the normal vector is $\overrightarrow{N} = \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{1+S_2}}(-w_1, \ldots, -w_n, 1)$ and hence for entropy S one has

$$S(\boldsymbol{x}) = x_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i = \sqrt{1+S_2}\,\overrightarrow{X} \cdot \overrightarrow{N}. \tag{4.25}$$

So the normal vector has pure probabilistic character and the entropy is the difference between x_{n+1} and mean value $\bar{x}$.

5. Non-ideal case

Hypersurfaces with nonlinear and nonseparable functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ correspond to macroscopic systems with interaction between particles, molecula *etc.* Properties of such non-ideal hypersurfaces vary according to properties of functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$. Here we consider few illustrative examples.

The first case is $n = 2$, $m = 1$ and

$$F(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2 + \varphi(x_1, x_2) \tag{5.1}$$

where $\varphi(x_1, x_2)$ is a function.

One has a surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ given by

$$x_3 = x_1 + x_2 + \varphi(x_1, x_2) \tag{5.2}$$

with all standard formulae for a surface.

The second example corresponds to $n = 3$, $m = 2$ and

$$x_4 = \ln\left(e^{x_1+x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2} + e^{x_1+x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}\right) \tag{5.3}$$

where ε is a constant. One has $\dfrac{\partial x_4}{\partial x_1} = 1 + \varepsilon(w_1 x_2 + w_2 x_3)$, $\dfrac{\partial x_4}{\partial x_2} = w_1(1+\varepsilon x_1)$ and $\dfrac{\partial x_4}{\partial x_3} = w_2(1+\varepsilon x_1)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{11} &= 1 + [1 + \varepsilon(w_1 x_2 + w_2 x_3)]^2, & g_{23} &= w_1 w_2 (1+\varepsilon x_1)^2,\\
g_{12} &= (w_1 + \varepsilon(w_1^2 x_2 + w_1 w_2 x_3)) \cdot (1+\varepsilon x_1), & g_{22} &= 1 + w_1^2 (1+\varepsilon x_1)^2,\\
g_{13} &= (w_2 + \varepsilon(w_1 w_2 x_2 + w_2^2 x_3)) \cdot (1+\varepsilon x_1), & g_{33} &= 1 + w_2^2 (1+\varepsilon x_1)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\det \boldsymbol{g} &= 1 + (1 + \varepsilon(w_1 x_2 + w_2 x_3))^2 + (w_1^2 + w_2^2)(1+\varepsilon x_1)^2\\
&= \left[2 + w_1^2 + w_2^2\right] + \left[2(w_1 x_2 + w_2 x_3) + 2(w_1^2 + w_2^2) \cdot x_1\right] \varepsilon\\
&+ \left[(w_1^2 + w_2^2) \cdot x_1^2 + (w_1 x_2 + w_2 x_3)^2\right] \varepsilon^2
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where $w_1 = \dfrac{e^{x_1+x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2}}{e^{x_1+x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2} + e^{x_1+x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}}$ and $w_2 = \dfrac{e^{x_1+x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}}{e^{x_1+x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2} + e^{x_1+x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}}$. The Gauss-Kronecker curvature is given by

$$K = -\frac{w_1 w_2 \cdot \varepsilon^2 (1+\varepsilon x_1)^2}{\det \boldsymbol{g}^{\frac{5}{2}}}. \tag{5.6}$$

So the Gauss-Kronecker curvature is different from zero. It is connected also with the fact that the formula (5.3) is not invariant under the shift $x_i \mapsto x_i + a$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Finally, for entropy one finds

$$S = \ln(e^{x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2} + e^{x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}) - \frac{(1+\varepsilon x_1)\cdot(e^{x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2}\cdot x_2 + e^{x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}\cdot x_3)}{e^{x_2+\varepsilon x_1 x_2} + e^{x_3+\varepsilon x_1 x_3}}. \quad (5.7)$$

It should be noted that Gauss-Kronecker curvature can be zero even in non-ideal case. It happens if a hypersurface admits a translational symmetry. For instance, if instead of (5.3) the hypersurface is defined by

$$x_4 = \ln\left(e^{x_1+x_2+\varepsilon(x_1-x_2)^2} + e^{x_1+x_3+\varepsilon(x_1-x_3)^2}\right) \quad (5.8)$$

then it is invariant under the transformation $x_i \mapsto x_i' = x_i + a$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, $x_4 \mapsto x_4' = x_4 + 2a$ and the corresponding Gauss-Kronecker curvature is $K = 0$.

In physics it is often quite useful to study first corrections to ideality for "small" interactions. For hypersurfaces it corresponds to "small" nonlinearities. Let us consider the hypersurface given by (5.3) with $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and calculate first order corrections in ε to ideal case. Denoting the first order corrections in ε of the function f by $I_\varepsilon[f]$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} &I_\varepsilon[g_{11}] = 2(w_1x_2 + w_2x_3), && I_\varepsilon[g_{23}] = 2w_1w_2x_1,\\ &I_\varepsilon[g_{12}] = w_1^2x_2 + w_1w_2x_3 + w_1x_1, && I_\varepsilon[g_{22}] = 2w_1^2x_1,\\ &I_\varepsilon[g_{13}] = w_1w_2x_2 + w_2^2x_3 + w_2x_1, && I_\varepsilon[g_{33}] = 2w_2^2x_1 \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$I_\varepsilon[\det \boldsymbol{g}] = 2(w_1x_2 + w_2x_3) + 2(w_1^2 + w_2^2)\cdot x_1, \quad (5.10)$$

$$I_\varepsilon[K] = 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Second order correction for Gauss-Kronecker curvature does not vanishes. It can be seen from (5.6) and (5.6) that second order series coefficient is

$$II_\varepsilon[K] = -\frac{e^{x_2+x_3}(e^{x_2}+e^{x_3})^3}{(3e^{2x_2} + 4e^{x_2+x_3} + 3e^{2x_3})^{\frac{5}{2}}}. \quad (5.12)$$

Next let us consider the problem of the vanishing of first order corrections in a slighty more general case with a physical perspective. So, let P be a number of different subsystems $\mathcal{S}_p$, $p = 1, \dots, P$ with q_p different levels in subsystem $\mathcal{S}_p$ labeled by (x_i^p), where x_i^p is the i-th level in the p-th subsystems, $i = 1, 2, \dots, q_p$. Let us call the total number of levels $n = \sum_{p=1}^{P} q_p$ and put $\vec{x}_p \doteq (x_1^p, x_2^p, \dots, x_{q_p}^p)$, $p = 1, \dots, P$.

These systems interact via a function $\Gamma(x_{i_1}^1, x_{i_2}^2, \dots, x_{i_P}^P)$ of P variables. Thus the statistical mapping is given by

$$F(\boldsymbol{x}) = \ln\left(\sum_{s:\,\mathcal{P}\longrightarrow Q} e^{\Gamma(x^1_{s(1)}, x^2_{s(2)}, \dots, x^P_{s(P)})}\right), \quad (5.13)$$

where the sum is over all possible mappings $s : \{1, 2, \dots P\} \longrightarrow \bigcup_{p=1}^{P} \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $s(p)$ belongs to subsystem $\mathcal{S}_p$ for all $p = 1, \dots, P$. Functions f_α are now parametrized by the set $\mathcal{C}$ of all these mappings s. So, $m = \#\mathcal{C} = q_1 \cdot q_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot q_P$ and Gibbs weight corresponding to s is

$$w_s \doteq \frac{e^{\Gamma(x^1_{s(1)}, x^2_{s(2)}, \dots, x^P_{s(P)})}}{\sum\limits_{t \in \mathcal{C}} e^{\Gamma(x^1_{t(1)}, x^2_{t(2)}, \dots, x^P_{t(P)})}}. \tag{5.14}$$

In order to study deviation from ideality, we have to define what an ideal linear model of P non-interacting subsystems is. Due to the relations (3.1) and (3.2), it is natural to consider possible energies as $i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} c_p x_p$ for real constants c_p and all possible choices of x_p in the p-th subsystem. So ideal statistical mapping is $F_0(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_P) = \ln\left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{C}} \prod_{p=1}^{P} e^{i(x^1_{t(t)}, \dots, x^P_{t(P)})}\right) = \ln\left[\prod_{p=1}^{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{q_p} e^{c_p x_i^p}\right)\right]$ that is

$$F_0(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_P) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \varphi_p(\vec{x}_p) \tag{5.15}$$

where

$$\varphi_p(\vec{x}_p) \doteq \ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^{q_p} e^{c_p x_i^p}\right), \quad p = 1, \dots, P. \tag{5.16}$$

Then Hessian matrix is block diagonal and the model is ideal since it is linear and Gauss-Kronecker curvature vanishes: indeed, vector $(\underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{n})^T$ is an eigenvector of Hessian matrix with eigenvalue 0.

Perturbation of this model means passing from $i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P)$ to $i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P) + \varepsilon \cdot \gamma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P)$. So one has

Proposition 5.1 *For "small" perturbations of the form $\varepsilon \cdot \gamma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P)$, where $\gamma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P)$ is any smooth function and $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, the first order correction in ε to the Gauss-Kronecker curvature of the statistical hypersurface defined by $F(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_P) = \ln\left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{C}} \exp(j(x^1_{t(1)}, x^2_{t(2)}, \dots, x^P_{t(P)}))\right]$ with $j(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} c_p x_p + \varepsilon \cdot \gamma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_P)$ vanishes.*

Proof: See Appendix Appendix A. □

6. Singularities of the statistical hypersurface

Connection of hypersurfaces V_n with statistical physics suggests to analyze non-smooth behaviour analogous to that typical for phase transitions.

Following the standard classification of phase transitions (see e.g. [1]) we will refer to a singularity of hypersurface V_n for which all derivatives of F of order $0, 1, \dots, k-1$ are continuous and at least one derivative of order k is discontinuous as k-th order phase singularity. For the singularity of the first order a hypersurface is smooth while the metric and second form are discontinuous. For example, hypersurface has an edge and metric and second form exhibit a jump along this edge. At the same time curvature, in general, blows up. For the second order singularity hypersurface, metric and normal vector are smooth while curvature has a jump. Due to a rather complicated expression for the Riemann curvature tensor and Gauss-Kronecker curvature they may have no blow up. We will refer to such singularities as hidden.

Ideal hypersurfaces defined by (3.2) clearly do not have such phase singularities. On the other hand an analysis of case of general nonlinear functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ is rather involved. Here we will discuss few examples of non-ideal statistical hypersurface in order to illustrate some properties of hidden and visible singularities. First order phase singularities are considered in first two examples.

First example: visible singularities at $n = 2$. Let $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = y$ be coordinates and $\{f_\alpha(x, y)\}$ for $\alpha = 2, \dots, m$ be smooth functions, e.g. linear functions $f_\alpha(x, y) = c_{\alpha 1}x + c_{\alpha 2}y$. Then let us consider function $f_1(x, y) \doteq s(x) + h(y)$ with

$$s(x) = \sqrt[3]{(x - x_0)^4} + (x - x_0) \cdot \Theta(x - x_0), \tag{6.1}$$

where $\Theta(x)$ is Heaviside step function and $h(y)$ is a smooth function such that there exist points $\{\bar{y}\}$ where $h''(\bar{y}) > 0$. Here we denote $h'(\bar{y}) = c_{12}$. Then $\dfrac{\partial f_1}{\partial y}$, $\dfrac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x}$ and $\dfrac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial y}$ are continuous for all $\alpha \geq 2$ and $\left(\dfrac{\partial f_1}{\partial x}\right)^2$ is finite and discontinuous at $x = x_0$. So g_{11} and $\det \boldsymbol{g}$ have a jump here, i.e. it is a first order phase singularity. Even if F is not differentiable at $x = x_0$ one can study the behaviour of its Hessian determinant in a neighborhood of this point. First, $\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x \partial y}$ is finite since all second derivatives $\dfrac{\partial^2 f_\alpha}{\partial x \partial y} = 0$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$ and first derivatives are finite. Then, $\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2} = w_1 h'' + \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha c_{\alpha 2}^2 - \left(\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha c_{\alpha 2}\right)^2$ and at all points in $\{\bar{y}\}$ we have $h''(\bar{y}) > 0$, so $\left.\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2}\right|_{y=\bar{y}} > \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha c_{\alpha 2}^2 - \left(\sum\limits_{\beta=1}^{m} w_\beta c_{\beta 2}\right)^2 = \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha \left(c_{\alpha 2} - \sum\limits_{\beta=1}^{m} w_\beta c_{\beta 2}\right)^2 \geq 0$. Finally, $\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2} = w_1 s''(x) + w_1 (s'(x))^2 + \sum\limits_{\alpha=2}^{m} w_\alpha (c_{\alpha 1})^2 - \left(\bar{f}_1\right)^2$. Last three terms are everywhere finite while $\lim\limits_{x \to x_0 +} s''(x) = \lim\limits_{x \to x_0 -} s''(x) = +\infty$. Hence, Hessian determinant $\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2}\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2} - \left(\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x \partial y}\right)^2$ is equal to $w_1 \dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2} s''(x)$ plus some terms which stay finite for

$x \to x_0$. So, $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} w_1 \dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2} s''(x) = +\infty$ at all point $\{\bar{y}\}$ and Gauss curvature K and scalar curvature $2K$ diverge at $x \to x_0$.

Second example: hidden first order phase singularity. Let $A(x)$ be a $m \times (n-1)$ matrix whose entries are smooth functions of x of the type $A_{\alpha i}(x) = c_{\alpha i} + p_{\alpha i}(x)$, $c_{\alpha i}$ are real constants and all $p_{\alpha i}(x)$ tend to 0 as $x \to x_0$. More precisely, let the matrix $A_0 \doteq (c_{\alpha i})_{\alpha=1,\ldots,m}^{i=2,\ldots,n}$ corresponds to an ideal model with $\det A_0 = 0$ and $p_{\alpha i}(x) \sim q_{\alpha i} \cdot (x - x_0)^2$ for $x \sim x_0$, with real constants $q_{\alpha i}$, $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$ and $i = 2, \ldots, n$. Then, we introduce the function

$$s(x) = \left(x - \frac{x}{2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{x_0^2}} - \frac{x_0 \cdot \arcsin(\frac{x}{x_0})}{2} \right) \Theta(x_0^2 - x^2) + x_0 \frac{4-\pi}{4} \Theta(x - x_0) - x_0 \frac{4-\pi}{4} \Theta(-x_0 - x). \tag{6.2}$$

The statistical model is given by the y-linear system $\tilde{f}_\alpha(x, y_2, \ldots, y_n) = \sum\limits_{i=2}^{n} A_{\alpha i}(x) y_i$, $\alpha = 1, \ldots, m$, in presence of background $s(x)$, so $f_\alpha(x, y_2, \ldots, x_n) = s(x) + \tilde{f}_\alpha(x, y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ and basic statistical mapping is $F(x, \boldsymbol{y}) = s(x) + F_2(x, \boldsymbol{y})$ where

$$F_2(x, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \doteq \ln \left(\sum_{\beta=1}^{m} e^{\tilde{f}_\beta(x, y_2, \ldots, y_n)} \right). \tag{6.3}$$

One has $\left(\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial x} \right)^2 = (s'(x))^2 + 2 \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{m} s'(x) \dfrac{\partial \tilde{f}_\alpha}{\partial x} w_\alpha + \sum\limits_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \dfrac{\partial \tilde{f}_\alpha}{\partial x} \dfrac{\partial \tilde{f}_\beta}{\partial x} w_\alpha w_\beta$. Last two sums are continuous at $x = x_0$ since $s'(x)|_{x=x_0}$ is discontinuous but finite and $\left. \dfrac{\partial \tilde{f}_\alpha}{\partial x} \right|_{x=x_0} = 0$. In contrast, $(s'(x))^2$ is discontinuous at $x = x_0$ since $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0+} (s'(x))^2 \neq \lim\limits_{x\to x_0-} (s'(x))^2$. So we have a first order phase singularity that is observed also in $\det \boldsymbol{g}$ which is finite and discontinuous at $x = x_0$. We now study the behaviour of the Gauss-Kronecker curvature near the singularity $x = x_0$. First, $\left. \dfrac{\partial^2 F_2}{\partial x \partial y_i} \right|_{x=x_0} = 0$ since $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} p'_{\alpha i}(x) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus, only non-trivial term in the Hessian of F near $x = x_0$ is $\dfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2} \mathrm{Hess}[F_2; \boldsymbol{y}]$. Then, $\mathrm{Hess}[F; \boldsymbol{y}] = \mathrm{Hess}[F_2; \boldsymbol{y}]$ is regular and $\mathrm{Hess}[F_2; \boldsymbol{y}]|_{x=x_0} = \det(A_0) = 0$ by continuity. This implies that all terms of the Hessian except $s''(x) \cdot \mathrm{Hess}[F_2; \boldsymbol{y}]$ vanish at $x = x_0$. Finally, $s''(x) \cdot \mathrm{Hess}[F_2; \boldsymbol{y}]$ involves terms $\dfrac{x \cdot (x - x_0)^M}{x_0 \cdot \sqrt{x_0^2 - x^2}}$, with $M \geq 2$ and $\dfrac{x \cdot \det(A_0)}{x_0 \cdot \sqrt{x_0^2 - x^2}} \equiv 0$. The latter can be seen in the same form with $M = +\infty$ since its singularity at $x = x_0$ is a removable one. All these expressions vanish at $x \to x_0$. So, Hessian determinant and Gauss-Kronecker curvature can be set to zero on the submanifold $\mathcal{S} : x = x_0$ where the phase singularity in $\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial x}$ is hidden.

Third example deals with both first and second order phase singularities. Let us take functions $\{\tilde{f}_\alpha(y_2,\dots,y_n)\}$ to define a smooth statistical mapping $\tilde{F}$, e.g. $\tilde{f}_\alpha(y_2,\dots,y_n)=\sum_{i=2}^{n} a_{\alpha i}y_i$ and $\boldsymbol{a} \doteq (a_{\alpha i})_{\alpha=1,\dots,m}^{i=2,\dots,n}$. Then consider a non-interacting background x and a function $s(x)$ which expresses its energy and define $f_\alpha(x,\boldsymbol{y}) = s(x)+\tilde{f}_\alpha(y_2,\dots,y_n)$. Hessian determinant of F is $s''(x)\cdot \mathrm{Hess}[\tilde{F},\boldsymbol{y}] = s''(x)\cdot(\boldsymbol{a}^T H \boldsymbol{a})$. So we can have a number of different behaviours.

(i) Take $s(x)=(x-x_0)\cdot|x-x_0|$. So $s'(x)=2\cdot|x-x_0|$ and $s''(x)=2\cdot\mathrm{sgn}(x-x_0)$, which is discontinuous and finite at $x=x_0$. If $\mathrm{Hess}[\tilde{F},\boldsymbol{y}]\equiv 0$, then $\mathrm{Hess}[F,\{x,\boldsymbol{y}\}]=0$ and the second order singularity is hidden. If instead $\mathrm{Hess}(\tilde{F},\boldsymbol{y})$ does not vanish identically, then Hessian is discontinuous and metric determinant stays finite and continuous. Hence, the Gauss-Kronecker curvature has a jump and the second order singularity is visible.

(ii) Take $\tilde{F}$ such that $\mathrm{Hess}[\tilde{F},\boldsymbol{y}]$ does not vanish identically. If $s(x)=\sqrt[3]{x-x_0}$, then at $x\sim x_0$ one has $\mathrm{Hess}(F,\boldsymbol{x})\sim(x-x_0)^{-\frac{5}{3}}$ and $(\det \boldsymbol{g})^{\frac{n+2}{2}}\sim(x-x_0)^{-\frac{2n+4}{3}}$. Thus metric determinant blows up and Gauss-Kronecker curvature vanishes as $\dfrac{\mathrm{Hess}(F,\{x,\boldsymbol{y}\})}{(\det \boldsymbol{g})^{\frac{n+2}{2}}}\sim(x_1-x_0)^{\frac{2n-1}{3}}$. So the first order singularity is hidden on the singular locus $\mathcal{L}: x_1=x_0$. If instead $s(x)=\sqrt[3]{(x-x_0)^4}$, then the metric determinant stays finite and continuous and the Hessian tends to $+\infty$. So Gauss-Kronecker curvature tends to $\pm\infty$ (depending on the sign of $\mathrm{Hess}(\tilde{F},\boldsymbol{y})$) as well.

7. Tropical limit

Following the ideas of the limit-set for algebraic varieties proposed in [22] and intensively developed later tropical geometry (see e.g. [23, 24, 25, 26]), we will study here limiting properties of statistical hypersurfaces. Thus, we are interested in behaviour of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ defined by the relation

$$x_{n+1}=\ln\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} e^{f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})}\right). \tag{7.1}$$

at infinitely large values of the variables $x_1,\dots,x_n,x_{n+1}$ assuming that they take values in unbounded intervals. Properties of statistical hypersurfaces in such infinite blow up depend crucially on functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ in (7.1).

Let us begin with the simplest super-ideal case, i.e. that defined by (4.1). All variables $x_1,\dots,x_{n+1}$ enter there on equal footing. So it is natural to consider the situation when all these variables are large uniformly, i.e. when they are given by

$$x_i=\lambda x_i^\star,\quad i=1,\dots,n,n+1 \tag{7.2}$$

where λ is a large parameter and all $x_i^\star$ are finite. In terms of variables $x_i^\star$ one has a family of super-ideal hypersurfaces $V_n(\lambda)$ defined by the relation

$$x_{n+1}^\star = \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} e^{\lambda x_i^\star} \right). \tag{7.3}$$

The limiting hypersurface $V_n(\infty)$ ($\lambda \to \infty$) is given by

$$x_{n+1}^\star = \max\{x_1^\star, \dots, x_n^\star\} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bigoplus x_i^\star \tag{7.4}$$

where $\sum \bigoplus$ denotes tropical (semiring) summation. This is the standard tropical expression (see e.g. [23, 24, 25, 26]) in which instead of λ the parameter $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ is usually used.

Note that the relation (7.2) can be viewed as the homothety (uniform scaling) transformation

$$x_i \mapsto x_i^\star = \frac{1}{\lambda} x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n+1. \tag{7.5}$$

Hence the hypersurface given by (7.4) is the limiting ($\lambda \to \infty$) homothetic image (independent of λ) of the hypersurface (4.1) for large $x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}$.

The tropical limit of the super-ideal statistical hypersurface is the union of hyperplanes P_i:

$$V_{n,\mathrm{trop}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \overline{P}_i \tag{7.6}$$

where $P_{i_0} = \{\vec{x}^\star : \ x_{n+1}^\star - x_{i_0}^\star = 0, x_{i_0}^\star > x_1^\star, \dots, x_{i_0-1}^\star, x_{i_0+1}^\star, \dots, x_n^\star\}$ and $\overline{P}_{i_0}$ is its closure. Note that $V_{n,\mathrm{trop}}$ is the union of hyperplanes passing through the origin ($x_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, n+1$). For instance, at $n = 2$ $V_{2,\mathrm{trop}}$ is the union of two half-planes $\overline{P}_1$ and $\overline{P}_2$ defined as $P_1 = \{(x_1^\star, x_2^\star, x_3^\star) : \ x_3^\star - x_1^\star = 0, x_1^\star > x_2^\star\}$ and $P_2 = \{(x_1^\star, x_2^\star, x_3^\star) : \ x_3^\star - x_2^\star = 0, x_2^\star > x_1^\star\}$. Gibbs probabilities w_i in the tropical limit takes values 0 or 1 on hyperplanes P_i, namely $w_{i_0} = 1$ and $w_i = 0$ if $x_{i_0}^\star > x_i^\star$ for all $i \neq i_0$.

Geometric characteristics of each member of the family of hypersurfaces (7.3) (at fixed λ) is calculable directly taking into account that in terms of $x_i^\star$ the metric of the space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is $\lambda^2((dx_{n+1}^\star)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(dx_i^\star)^2)$. So the induced metric on $V_n(\lambda)$ is of the form

$$(ds)^2 = \lambda^2 \sum_{i,k=1}^{n} g_{ik}^\star(\lambda) dx_i^\star dx_k^\star \tag{7.7}$$

where

$$g_{ik}^\star(\lambda) = \delta_{ik} + w_i^\star(\lambda) \cdot w_k^\star(\lambda) \tag{7.8}$$

and

$$w_i^\star(\lambda) = \frac{e^{\lambda x_i^\star}}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{\lambda x_k^\star}}. \tag{7.9}$$

Similarly, for Ω_{ik}, R_{iklm} and Gauss-Kronecker curvature one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Omega_{ik}(\lambda) = \lambda^2 \cdot \frac{H^\star_{ik}(\lambda)}{\sqrt{1+\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} w_i^\star(\lambda)^2}},\\
&R_{iklj}(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^4}{1+\sum\limits_{h=1}^{n}\left(w_h^\star(\lambda)\right)^2} \cdot \left[H^\star_{kj}(\lambda)\cdot H^\star_{il}(\lambda) - H^\star_{kl}(\lambda)\cdot H^\star_{ij}(\lambda)\right], \qquad (7.10)\\
&K(\lambda) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$H^\star_{ij}(\lambda) \doteq w_i^\star(\lambda)\cdot(\delta_{ij} - w_j^\star(\lambda)). \qquad (7.11)$$

At the limit $\lambda \to \infty$ the metric (7.8) becomes piecewise. On each hyperplane P_{i_0} it is a constant diagonal one

$$g^{(i_0)}_{ik,\mathrm{trop}} \equiv \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} g^\star_{ik}(\lambda) = \delta_{ik}(1+\delta_{i_0 i}), \quad i,k = 1,\dots n. \qquad (7.12)$$

On each hyperplane P_{i_0} one also has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Omega_{ik,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{\Omega_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda^2} = 0,\\
&R_{iklj,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{R_{iklj}(\lambda)}{\lambda^4} = 0, \qquad (7.13)\\
&K_{\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} K(\lambda) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and entropy $S^{(i_0)} = \lim\limits_{\lambda\to\infty}\lambda(x^\star_{n+1} - \overline{x^\star}) = 0$.

Tropical hypersurface (7.6) has singularities at the points where maximum is attained on two or more $x^\star_i$, i.e. on the hyperplanes $x^\star_i = x^\star_k$, $x^\star_i = x^\star_k = x^\star_l$ *etc.* At $n = 2$ it is the line $x^\star_1 = x^\star_2$. On these singularity the derivatives $\dfrac{\partial x^\star_{n+1}}{\partial x^\star_k}$, normal vector $\vec{N}$ and entropy $\vec{S}$ are discontinuous. So one has first order phase singularities. On the singularities of the type $x^\star_{i_0} = x^\star_{k_0}$ the probabilities are $w_{i_0} = w_{k_0} = \dfrac{1}{2}$. On hyperplanes $x^\star_{i_1} = x^\star_{i_2} = \ldots = x^\star_{i_k}$ one has $w_{i_1} = w_{i_2} = \ldots = w_{i_k} = \dfrac{1}{k}$.

Crossing such singular "edges", the metric (7.7) jumps from one diagonal to another one. On singularity edge the tropical metric $g_{ik,\mathrm{trop}}$ is not diagonal. For instance, on the singularity edge $x^\star_{i_0} = x^\star_{k_0}$ one has

$$g^{(i_0,k_0)}_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} = \delta_{ij}(1+\frac{1}{4}\delta_{i_0 i} + \frac{1}{4}\delta_{k_0 i}) + \frac{1}{4}(\delta_{i_0 i}\delta_{k_0 j} + \delta_{k_0 i}\delta_{i_0 j}) \qquad (7.14)$$

and

$$\Omega^{(i_0,k_0)}_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} = \lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{\Omega_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda^2} = \frac{\delta_{ij}\delta_{i_0 i} + \delta_{ij}\delta_{k_0 i} - \delta_{i_0 j}\delta_{k_0 i} - \delta_{k_0 j}\delta_{i_0 i}}{\sqrt{24}} \qquad (7.15)$$

for $i,j = 1,\dots,n$. Christoffel symbols and curvature are also discontinuous on singularity edges.

The tropical limit of mean and scalar curvature is

$$\Omega_{\rm trop} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \Omega(\lambda) = \frac{1 - S_{3,\rm trop}}{\sqrt{(1 + S_{2,\rm trop})^3}} \tag{7.16}$$

and

$$R_{\rm trop} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} R(\lambda) = \frac{2(1 + S_{4,\rm trop})}{(1 + S_{2,\rm trop})^2} - 1 \tag{7.17}$$

where

$$S_{p,\rm trop} \doteq \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w_{i,\rm trop})^p. \tag{7.18}$$

At the regular points $S_{p,\rm trop} = 1 = S_p|_{\vec{e}_\alpha}$ and $\Omega_{\rm trop} = R_{\rm trop} = 0$. At the singularity edge with $x^\star_{i_1} = x^\star_{i_2} = \ldots = x^\star_{i_r}$ one has $S_{p,\rm trop} = \dfrac{1}{r^{p-1}}$ and, hence

$$\Omega^{(r)}_{\rm trop} = \frac{r-1}{\sqrt{r(r+1)}}, \quad R^{(r)}_{\rm trop} = \frac{(r-1)(r-2)}{r(r+1)}. \tag{7.19}$$

At the most singular edge with $r = n$

$$\Omega^{(n)}_{\rm trop} = \frac{n-1}{\sqrt{n(n+1)}}, \quad R^{(n)}_{\rm trop} = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{n(n+1)} \tag{7.20}$$

that coincide with maximum values of mean and scalar curvatures of super-ideal statistical hypersurface.

Note that the tropical limit in statistical physics of macroscopic systems with highly degenerate energy levels studied in [27] corresponds to a very special, essentially one-dimensional case of above consideration when all $x_i = S_i - \dfrac{\varepsilon_i}{T}$, S_i, ε_i are constants and T is a variable (temperature). Scaling parameter used in [27] is $\lambda = \dfrac{1}{k}$ where k is the Boltzmann constant. So, the results obtained in [27] describe some properties of line sections of the tropical limit of super-ideal statistical hypersurfaces.

Tropical limit of ideal hypersurfaces given by (3.2) is formally quite similar to the super-ideal case. It is given by

$$x^\star_{n+1} = \max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x^\star_i,\ \alpha = 1, \ldots, m\right\} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \bigoplus (\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x^\star_i). \tag{7.21}$$

However, the presence of parameters $a_{\alpha i}$ and the fact that $n \neq m$ make the situation richer. Tropical ideal hypersurface is the union of m hyperplanes P_α, namely

$$V^{\rm linear}_{n,\rm trop} = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{m} \overline{P}_\alpha \tag{7.22}$$

where we have defined $P_\alpha = \{\overrightarrow{x^\star} :\ x^\star_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x^\star_i,\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x^\star_i > \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\beta i} x^\star_i,\ \beta \neq \alpha\}$. Outside the singular sector, metric (3.4) on P_α is again equal to a constant metric depending on $a_{\alpha i}$, i.e.

$$g^{(\alpha)}_{ij,\rm trop} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} g^\star_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + a_{\alpha i} \cdot a_{\alpha j}, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots n. \tag{7.23}$$

Depending on $a_{\alpha i}$ there are variety of singularity hyperplanes on which metric, normal vector and entropy are discontinuous having specific values on singularity edges.

At the special case discussed at the end of the section 3 tropical limit considered above is closely connected with the tropical limit of $\log \tau$ for m-soliton solutions for Korteweg–de Vries and Kadomtsev–Petviashvili equations studied in [28, 29, 30, 31].

8. Double scaling tropical limit in non-ideal case

Tropical limit of non-ideal statistical hypersurfaces is more complicated due to the variety of possible behaviour of functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ under dilatation. In a simple case, when all functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ are homogeneous functions of degree one ($f_\alpha(\lambda \boldsymbol{x}^\star) = \lambda f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)$), the corresponding statistical hypersurface in the standard tropical limit is given by

$$x^\star_{n+1} = \max\{f_1(\boldsymbol{x}^\star), f_2(\boldsymbol{x}^\star), \dots, f_m(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)\} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \bigoplus f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star). \tag{8.1}$$

So

$$V^{\text{non-ideal}}_{n,\text{trop}} = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{m} \overline{V}_\alpha \tag{8.2}$$

where the hypersurface V_{α_0} is defined by

$$V_{\alpha_0} = \{\overrightarrow{x^\star} : \; x^\star_{n+1} - f_{\alpha_0}(\boldsymbol{x}^\star) = 0, \; f_{\alpha_0}(\boldsymbol{x}^\star) > f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star), \; \alpha \neq \alpha_0\} \tag{8.3}$$

and $\overline{V}_{\alpha_0}$ is its closure. On the hypersurface V_{α_0} the probability $w_{\alpha_0} = 1$ while $w_\beta = 0$, $\beta \neq \alpha_0$.

Hence, the tropical limit of the metric (2.1) on V_{α_0} is

$$g^{(\alpha_0)}_{ik,\text{trop}} = \delta_{ik} + \frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i}\frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_k}, \quad i,k = 1,\dots n; \tag{8.4}$$

there is no summation on α_0 here. Then, on each V_{α_0} one has tropical limits of Γ^l_{ik}, Ω_{ik}, R_{iklj} and K given by formulae (2.10)-(2.14) in which instead of summation over α there is tropical summation over α, i.e. there is only the term with $\alpha = \alpha_0$ since $\bar{f}_i = \dfrac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i}$. The tropical limit of the entropy on V_{α_0} is $S_{\alpha_0} = x^\star_{n+1} - f_{\alpha_0}(\boldsymbol{x}^\star) = 0$. Singularity "edges" now are hypersurfaces of the type $f_{\alpha_0}(\boldsymbol{x}^\star) = f_{\alpha_1}(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)$ on which all characteristics are discontinuous.

Situation is quite different in the case when functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ are all homogeneous of degree $d > 1$. In such a case the definition (1.3) implies that in the tropical regime the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}$ are large, but not uniformly. The natural parametrization of large variables, instead of (7.2), now is

$$x_i = \lambda x^\star_i, \; i = 1, \dots, n; \quad x_{n+1} = \lambda^d x^\star_{n+1}. \tag{8.5}$$

It is easy to see that only with such a rescaling the hypersurface $V_n(\lambda)$ defined by

$$x^\star_{n+1} = \frac{1}{\lambda^d} \ln\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} e^{\lambda^d f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)}\right) \tag{8.6}$$

has finite, independent on λ, tropical limit at $\lambda \to \infty$. It is given by the formula

$$x^\star_{n+1} = \max\{f_1(\boldsymbol{x}^\star), f_2(\boldsymbol{x}^\star), \dots, f_m(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)\} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \bigoplus f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star). \tag{8.7}$$

The squared line element of the space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ under this rescaling becomes

$$(ds)^2 = \lambda^{2d}(dx^\star_{n+1})^2 + \lambda^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n}(dx^\star_i)^2. \tag{8.8}$$

So the induced metric of the hypersurface V_n (8.6) is of the form

$$g_{ik}(\lambda) = \lambda^2\delta_{ik} + \lambda^{2d} \cdot \overline{f_i(\lambda)} \cdot \overline{f_k(\lambda)}, \quad i,k = 1,\dots,n \tag{8.9}$$

where

$$\bar{f}_i(\lambda) \doteq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x^\star_i} \tag{8.10}$$

and unit normal vector (with respect to the metric (8.8)) is

$$\vec{N}(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^{n+d-2}}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{g}(\lambda)}}\left(-\bar{f}_1(\lambda), -\bar{f}_2(\lambda), \dots, -\bar{f}_n(\lambda), \lambda^{2-2d}\right) \tag{8.11}$$

Hence, in the limit $\lambda \to \infty$, on each hypersurface V_{α_0} one has

$$g^{(\alpha_0)}_{ik,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{g_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda^{2d}} = \frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i} \cdot \frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_k}, \quad i,k = 1,\dots,n. \tag{8.12}$$

At large λ the dominant terms in $\Gamma^l_{ik}(\lambda)$, $\Omega_{ik}(\lambda)$, $R_{iklm}(\lambda)$ and $K(\lambda)$ are of the orders 0, 1, 2 and $2-n-2d$ in λ, respectively. Hence, on V_{α_0}

$$\Gamma^{l\,(\alpha_0)}_{ik,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \Gamma^l_{ik}(\lambda) = \frac{\dfrac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i \partial x^\star_j} \cdot \dfrac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_l}}{\displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_h}\right)^2}, \tag{8.13}$$

$$\Omega^{(\alpha_0)}_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{\Omega_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda} = \frac{\dfrac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i \partial x^\star_j}}{\sqrt{\displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_h}\right)^2}}, \tag{8.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(\alpha_0)}_{iklj,\mathrm{trop}} &\doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{R_{iklj}(\lambda)}{\lambda^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_h}\right)^2} \cdot \left[\frac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_k \partial x^\star_j} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i \partial x^\star_l} - \frac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_k \partial x^\star_l} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x^\star_i \partial x^\star_j}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{8.15}$$

and

$$K_{\text{trop}}^{(\alpha_0)} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^{n+2d-2} \cdot K(\lambda) = \frac{\det \left| \dfrac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x_i^\star \partial x_j^\star} \right|}{\left[\displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\partial f_{\alpha_0}}{\partial x_h^\star} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{n}{2}+1}}. \tag{8.16}$$

Dominant behaviours at the limit $\lambda \to \infty$ changes drastically on singular locus where two or more $f_{\alpha_1} = f_{\alpha_2} = \ldots = f_{\alpha_r}$ attain the maximum. Some results are discussed in the Appendix Appendix B.

Tropical metric (8.12) is degenerate. It is a consequence of the degeneration of the metric (8.8) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Consequently, the tropical limit of other geometric characteristics has a rather special structure too.

We see that in this case the double scaling limit defined via (8.5) provides us with the effective tropical limit, in constrast to the usual scaling limit. Note that the double scaling limit technique is a widely used tool in statistical physics and quantum field theory (see e.g. [32]).

The double scaling tropical limit is useful also in cases of more general functions $f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$. For instance, if

$$f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\alpha i} x_i + \varphi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{8.17}$$

where all $\varphi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})$ are homogeneous functions of degree $d > 1$, then the limit (8.5) produces the tropical hypersurface given by

$$x_{n+1}^\star = \max\{\varphi_1(\boldsymbol{x}^\star), \ldots, \varphi_m(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)\} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \bigoplus \varphi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star). \tag{8.18}$$

In this case, the tropical limit is defined by the nonlinear (interaction) terms.

A simple example is provided by the hypersurface in (5.3) with $d = 2$, $m = 2$, $n = 3$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. The double rescaling now is

$$x_i = \lambda x_i^\star,\ i = 1, 2, 3; \quad x_4 = \lambda^2 x_4^\star. \tag{8.19}$$

and the double scaling tropical limit of the hypersurface (5.3) is given by

$$x_4^\star = \varepsilon \cdot \max\{x_1^\star x_2^\star, x_1^\star x_3^\star\} = \varepsilon(x_1^\star x_2^\star) \oplus \varepsilon(x_1^\star x_3^\star). \tag{8.20}$$

It is the union of hypersurfaces

$$V_{3,\text{trop}} = \overline{V}_1 \cup \overline{V}_2 \tag{8.21}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \{(x_1^\star, x_2^\star, x_3^\star, x_4^\star) :\ x_4^\star - \varepsilon x_1^\star x_2^\star = 0,\ \varepsilon x_1^\star x_2^\star > \varepsilon x_1^\star x_3^\star\} \\ V_2 &= \{(x_1^\star, x_2^\star, x_3^\star, x_4^\star) :\ x_4^\star - \varepsilon x_1^\star x_3^\star = 0,\ \varepsilon x_1^\star x_3^\star > \varepsilon x_1^\star x_2^\star\}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.22}$$

On V_1 the tropical metric and second fundamental form are

$$g^{(1)}_{ik,\mathrm{trop}} = \varepsilon^2 \begin{pmatrix} x_2^{\star 2} & x_1^\star x_2^\star & 0 \\ x_1^\star x_2^\star & x_1^{\star 2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Omega^{(1)}_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} = \frac{\delta_{i1}\cdot\delta_{j2} + \delta_{i2}\cdot\delta_{j1}}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}} \tag{8.23}$$

and on V_2

$$g^{(2)}_{ik,\mathrm{trop}} = \varepsilon^2 \begin{pmatrix} x_3^{\star 2} & 0 & x_1^\star x_3^\star \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_1^\star x_3^\star & 0 & x_1^{\star 2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Omega^{(2)}_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} = \frac{\delta_{i1}\cdot\delta_{j3} + \delta_{i3}\cdot\delta_{j1}}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_3^2}}. \tag{8.24}$$

One also has

$$R^{(1)}_{iklj,\mathrm{trop}} = \frac{1}{x_1^{\star 2} + x_2^{\star 2}} \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = l = 1, i = j = 2 \\ 1, & \text{if } k = l = 2, i = j = 1 \\ -1, & \text{if } k = j = 1, i = l = 2 \\ -1, & \text{if } k = j = 2, i = l = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad K^{(1)}_{\mathrm{trop}} = 0 \tag{8.25}$$

and

$$R^{(2)}_{iklj,\mathrm{trop}} = \frac{1}{x_1^{\star 2} + x_3^{\star 2}} \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = l = 1, i = j = 3 \\ 1, & \text{if } k = l = 3, i = j = 1 \\ -1, & \text{if } k = j = 1, i = l = 3 \\ -1, & \text{if } k = j = 3, i = l = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad K^{(2)}_{\mathrm{trop}} = 0. \tag{8.26}$$

Comparing the ideal and non-ideal cases we see that in the tropical limit difference between them becomes easily visible geometrically. Indeed, the tropical limit of ideal statistical hypersurface is a piecewise hyperplane while in the non-ideal case it is piecewise curved hypersurface. Moreover, the double scaling tropical limit reveals the dominant role of interactions (nonlinear terms).

In more details the double and multi-scaling versions of the tropical limit and their applications to statistical physics, study of statistical hypersurfaces and other geometric objects will be considered in a separate publication.

Appendix A.

Here we will use, for notational simplicity, both double index notation x_i^p and single index notation x_i, with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, corresponding to the ordering of coordinates first by index p and then by index i: $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = (x_1^1, \ldots, x_{q_1}^1, x_1^2, \ldots, x_{q_2}^2, x_1^3, \ldots, x_{q_P-1}^P, x_{q_P}^P)$.

Proof: The first order correction for the determinant $\det C = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}(n)} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\cdot\prod_{i=1}^n c_{i\sigma(i)}$ of any matrix $C = (c_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n}$ whose entries depends on a parameter ε is given by sum of first order corrections for each term:

$$I_\varepsilon[\det A] = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}(n)} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\cdot\sum_{j=1}^n I_\varepsilon[c_{j\sigma(j)}] \prod_{j\neq i=1}^n c_{i\sigma(i)}|_{\varepsilon=0}. \tag{A.1}$$

Applying this to the Hessian determinant of F, we get

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}(n)} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n} I_\varepsilon[\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_j \partial x_{\sigma(j)}}]\cdot\prod_{j\neq i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 F|_{\varepsilon=0}}{\partial x_i\partial x_{\sigma(i)}}. \tag{A.2}$$

It follows from (5.15) that each product $\prod_{j\neq i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 F|_{\varepsilon=0}}{\partial x_i\partial x_{\sigma(i)}}$ is non-vanishing only when both i and $\sigma(i)$ belong to the same subsystem p, for all $i\neq j$. In such a case also j and $\sigma(j)$ must belong to the same subsystem, say p_j, as follows from injectivity of σ. So, non-vanishing terms correspond to $\sigma\in\prod_{p=1}^{P}\mathcal{S}(q_p)$. Now we can rewrite the first order correction of Hessian determinant as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\sigma_1\in\mathcal{S}(q_1)}\cdots\sum_{\sigma_P\in\mathcal{S}(q_P)}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_1)\cdot\ldots\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_P)\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n} I_\varepsilon[\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_j\partial x_{\sigma(j)}}]\cdot\prod_{j\neq i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 F|_{\varepsilon=0}}{\partial x_i\partial x_{\sigma(i)}}\\ &=\sum_{p=1}^{P}\det(1,p,F)\cdot\prod_{p\neq r=1}^{P}\det(0,r,F)\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where we have defined

$$\det(0,p,F)\doteq\sum_{\sigma_p\in\mathcal{S}(q_p)}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_p)\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{q_p}\frac{\partial^2 F|_{\varepsilon=0}}{\partial x_i^p\partial x^p_{\sigma_p(i)}} \tag{A.4}$$

and

$$\det(1,p,F)\doteq\sum_{\sigma_p\in\mathcal{S}(q_p)}\sum_{j=1}^{q_p}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_p)\cdot I_\varepsilon[\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_j^p\partial x^p_{\sigma_p(j)}}]\cdot\prod_{j\neq i=1}^{q_p}\frac{\partial^2 F|_{\varepsilon=0}}{\partial x_i^p\partial x^p_{\sigma_p(i)}}. \tag{A.5}$$

Each term in $\sum_{p=1}^{P}\det(1,p,F)\cdot\prod_{p\neq r=1}^{P}\det(0,r,F)$ contains a factor $\det(0,r,F)$, which is equal to zero since it is the Hessian determinant of a system of the form (5.16). So the whole sum vanishes. Hence, the Hessian of F is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$, i.e. its first order correction is equal to zero. The series expansion of $(\det\boldsymbol{g})^{-\frac{n+2}{2}}$ is regular at $\varepsilon=0$. Hence first non vanishing term in the expansion of Gauss-Kronecker curvature is at least of second order in ε. □

Appendix B.

The study of statistical hypersurface (8.6) for large λ shows major differences between regular sector V_α and singular sector $\overline{V}_\alpha\backslash V_\alpha$, $\alpha=1,\ldots,m$. We recall that the former is the set where $\max_\alpha\{f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}^\star)\}$ is attained only once, the latter is the set where the maximum is attained at least twice. In the following we suppose that $\{\bar\alpha_1,\ldots,\bar\alpha_r\}$ is the subset of indices $\{1,2,\ldots,m\}$ where $\max_\alpha\{f_\alpha(\boldsymbol{x})\}$ is attained. On the singular sector $r>1$ and one has

$$w_{\alpha,\mathrm{trop}}=\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}w_\alpha(\lambda)=\frac{1}{r}\cdot\sum_{p=1}^{r}\delta_{\bar\alpha_p\alpha}, \tag{B.1}$$

$$\bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}} = \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{\partial F(\lambda)}{\partial x_i^\star} = \frac{1}{r}\cdot\sum_{p=1}^{r} \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star}, \tag{B.2}$$

and

$$\Phi_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^d}\frac{\partial F(\lambda)}{\partial x_i^\star \partial x_j^\star} = \frac{1}{r}\cdot\sum_{p=1}^{r} \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_j^\star} - \bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{j,\mathrm{trop}}. \tag{B.3}$$

After simple computations, one finds

$$g_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} = \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{g_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda^{2d}} = \bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{j,\mathrm{trop}}, \tag{B.4}$$

$$\det \boldsymbol{g}_{\mathrm{trop}} = \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{\det \boldsymbol{g}(\lambda)}{\lambda^{2n+2d-2}} = \delta_{1,d} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\right)^2, \tag{B.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^l_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} &\doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{\Gamma^l_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda^d} = \frac{\Phi_{ij,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{l,\mathrm{trop}}}{\det \boldsymbol{g}_{\mathrm{trop}}} \\ &= \frac{\dfrac{\bar{f}_{l,\mathrm{trop}}}{r}\cdot\displaystyle\sum_{p=1}^{r}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_j^\star} - \bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{j,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{l,\mathrm{trop}}}{\delta_{1,d} + \displaystyle\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\bar{f}_{k,\mathrm{trop}}\right)^2},\end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

$$\Omega_{ij,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{\Omega_{ij}(\lambda)}{\lambda^{d+1}} = \frac{\dfrac{1}{r}\displaystyle\sum_{p=1}^{r}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_j^\star} - \bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{j,\mathrm{trop}}}{\sqrt{\delta_{1,d} + \displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{n}\left(\bar{f}_{h,\mathrm{trop}}\right)^2}}, \tag{B.7}$$

$$R_{iklj,\mathrm{trop}} \doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{R_{iklj}(\lambda)}{\lambda^{2d+2}} = \frac{\Phi_{kj,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\Phi_{il,\mathrm{trop}} - \Phi_{kl,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\Phi_{ij,\mathrm{trop}}}{\delta_{1,d} + \displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{n}\left(\bar{f}_{h,\mathrm{trop}}\right)^2} \tag{B.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}K_{\mathrm{trop}} &\doteq \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^{n+2d-2-dn}\cdot K(\lambda) \\ &= \frac{\det\left|\dfrac{1}{r}\displaystyle\sum_{p=1}^{r}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star}\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_j^\star} - \bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\cdot\bar{f}_{j,\mathrm{trop}}\right|}{\left[\delta_{1,d} + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\bar{f}_{i,\mathrm{trop}}\right)^2\right]^{\frac{n}{2}+1}}.\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

Main difference between the two sectors comes from second derivatives of (8.6)

$$\frac{\partial F_\lambda}{\partial x_i^\star \partial x_j^\star} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} w_\alpha(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i^\star \partial x_j^\star} + \lambda^d w_\alpha(\lambda) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i^\star} \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_j^\star} - \sum_{\beta=1}^{m} w_\beta(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial f_\beta}{\partial x_j^\star} \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_i^\star} \right). \tag{B.10}$$

Indeed, if $\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}_p$ for all $p = 1, \ldots, r$ then $\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \lambda^g \cdot w_{\lambda,\alpha} = 0$ for all real g. Then, non-vanishing terms in (B.10) are of the form

$$\sum_{p=1}^{r} w_{\bar{\alpha}_p}(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star \partial x_j^\star} \tag{B.11}$$

or

$$\sum_{p=1}^{r} \lambda^d w_{\bar{\alpha}_p}(\lambda) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star} \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_j^\star} - \sum_{q=1}^{r} w_{\bar{\alpha}_q}(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_q}}{\partial x_j^\star} \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_p}}{\partial x_i^\star} \right). \tag{B.12}$$

If $r = 1$ last term is $\lambda^d w_{\bar{\alpha}_1}(\lambda) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_1}}{\partial x_i^\star} \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_1}}{\partial x_j^\star} - \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_1}}{\partial x_j^\star} \frac{\partial f_{\bar{\alpha}_1}}{\partial x_i^\star} \right) = 0$ and (B.11) dominates for large λ. In this case one gets formulae (8.13)-(8.16). On the other hand, if $r > 1$ then (B.12) is non vanishing in general and this leads to expressions (B.6)-(B.9). Again, different patterns can be observed depending on the specific form of interactions.

References

[1] Landau L D and Lifschitz E M 1980 *Statistical Physics* vol 5 part 1 (*Course of Theoretical Physics*: Butterworth-Heinemann)

[2] Rao C R 1945 Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters *Bull. Cal. Math. Soc.* **37** pp 81-89

[3] Mrugala R 1988 Information geometry of nonideal gases *Trans. of the Tenth Prague Conf. on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes* vol 10A-B (Springer Netherlands) pp 193-200

[4] Gilmore R 1984 Length and curvature in the geometry of thermodynamics *Phys. Lett. A* **30** 4

[5] Quevedo H, Sanchez A, Taj S and Vazquez A 2010 Curvature as a measure of the thermodynamic interaction *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **57** 646

[6] Quevedo H, Sanchez A, Taj S and Vazquez A 2011 Phase transitions in geometrothermodynamics *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **43** 4 pp 1153-1165

[7] Quevedo H and Quevedo M N 2014 Cosmological implications of geometrothermodynamics *Gravitation and Cosmology* **20** 3 pp 208-213

[8] Bravetti A, Lopez-Monsalvo C S and Nettel F 2015 Contact symmetries and hamiltonian thermodynamics *Ann. Phys.-New York* **361** pp 377-400

[9] Passare M, Pochekutov D and Tsikh A 2012 Amoebas of complex hypersurfaces in statistical thermodynamics *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* **16** 1 pp 89-108

[10] Amari S and Nagaoka H 2000 *Methods of Information Geometry* (*Trans. of Mathematical monographs* vol 191 Am. Math. Soc.: Oxford University Press)

[11] Watanabe S 2009 *Algebraic Geometry and Statistical Learning Theory* (*Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics* vol 25 Cambridge University Press)

[12] Sun K and Marchand-Maillet S 2014 An information geometry of statistical manifold learning *Proc. of the 31st Int. Conf. on Machine Learning* ed Jebara T and Xing E P (ICML-14) pp 1-9

[13] Nie Y, Fellous J-M and Tatsuno M 2014 Information-geometric measures estimate neural interactions during oscillatory brain states *Front. Neural Circuits* **8** 11
[14] Dodson C T J 2012 Some illustrations of information geometry in biology and physics *Handbook of Research on Computational Science and Engineering: Theory and Practice* ed Leng J and Sharrock W (Hershey, PA: Engineering Science Reference) ch 13 pp 287-315
[15] Eisenhart L P 1997 *Riemannian Geometry* (*Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics and Physics*: Princeton University Press)
[16] Zadeh L A 1965 Fuzzy sets *Inform. Control* **8** 3 pp 338-353
[17] Klir G J and Folger T A 1988 *Fuzzy Sets, Uncertainty, and Information* (Prentice Hall)
[18] García-Ariza M A, Montesinos M and Torres del Castillo G F 2014 Geometric thermodynamics: black holes and the meaning of the scalar curvature, *Entropy* **16** pp 6515-6523
[19] Gantmacher F R 1977 *The Theory of Matrices* Vol I (AMS Chelsea)
[20] Hirota R 1980 Direct methods in soliton theory *Solitons* (*Topics in Current Physics* vol 17) ed Caudrey P and Bullough R K (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg)
[21] Hardy G H, Littlewood J E and Pólya G 1988 *Inequalities* (Cambridge Mathematical Library: Cambridge University Press)
[22] Bergman G M 1971 The logarithmic limit-set of an algebraic variety *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **157** pp 459-469
[23] Itenberg I, Mikhalkin G and Shustin E I 2009 *Tropical Algebraic Geometry* (*Oberwolfach Seminars* vol 35: Birkhäuser Basel)
[24] Viro O Ya 2011 On basic concepts of tropical geometry *Proc. Steklov Institute Math.* **273** (Pleiades Publ. Ltd.) pp 252-282
[25] Litvinov G L and Sergeev S N (Eds) 2009 *Tropical and Idempotent mathematics* (*Contemporary Mathematics* vol 495 Providence, RI: AMS)
[26] Maclagan D and Sturmfels B 2015 *Introduction to Tropical Geometry* (*Graduate Studies in Mathematics* vol 161 Providence, RI: AMS)
[27] Angelelli M and Konopelchenko B 2015 Tropical limit in statistical physics *Phys. Lett. A* **379** pp 1497-1502
[28] Biondini G and Chakravarty S 2006 Soliton solutions of the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili II equation *J. Math. Phys.* **47** 033514
[29] Chakravarty S and Kodama Y 2008 Classification of the line-soliton solutions of KP II *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** 27 275209
[30] Dimakis A and Müller-Hoissen F 2011 KP line solitons and Tamari Lattices *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44** 2 025203
[31] Dimakis A and Müller-Hoissen F 2014 KdV soliton interactions: a tropical view *J. Phys.: Conf. Series* **482** 1 012010
[32] Di Francesco P, Ginsparg P and Zinn-Justin J 1995 2D Gravity and Random Matrices *Phys. Rept.* **254** pp 1-133